

PATENT

Navy Case No. 84,219
Application No. 09/877,786REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 9, 11, 12, and 26 to address indefiniteness problems. Applicant has also amended claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 14-15, and 19-20 in order to more precisely define the invention. Finally, applicant has canceled claims 3, 8, 10, and 21 as superfluous in light of the amendments noted above.

Claims 9, 11, 12, and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the examiner objected to antecedent basis problems associated with claim 9 and clarity problems associated with claims 11, 12, and 26-27. Applicant has amended claims 9 and 11-12 to address these issues. Applicant has also amended claim 26 to address some potential issues not identified by the examiner. However, applicant believes that claims 26 and 27 clearly indicate that the spatial operation request originates with the client computer (the claims state "sending a spatial operation request by the client computer"). This language is not unclear, and, therefore, applicant has not amended said language.

Claims 1-3, 6-11, 13-16, 19-22, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Doyle et al., 2003/0154261 (hereinafter Doyle). Claims 4-5, 12, 17-18, and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Doyle in view of Roy et al., U.S. 6,337,693 (hereinafter Roy). Applicant will address these rejections together, as applicant believes that the above amendments, in conjunction with the below remarks, differentiates both of these references from the present invention to overcome these rejections.

In general, the present invention is different from the Doyle and Roy references in that these references describe systems that use data in one format, merely to view this

PATENT

Navy Case No. 84,219
Application No. 09/877,786

data on a client computer. Doyle uses data only in a raster format and Roy uses data only in a vector format. In the present invention, the servers provide data in multiple formats (raster, vector, tabular, etc.) and the map query server converts the different format data in a universal data language that can be read by the client computer. This allows for much more data related to specific geospatial areas to be displayed, analyzed, and transformed. Also, in both references, the client computer merely queries the databases containing the data and merely allows a user to view this data. While both references discuss "analysis of" or "interaction with" the data, neither reference discloses a system that actually provides new data by either transforming the original data or by comparing the original data to reference questions. In both references, the client computer merely queries the servers/databases for different portions of map data and the client computer merely displays this data. Both systems are "thin" systems, which merely allow for the client computer to view gathered data (not truly process or transform said data). For example, Roy discusses querying the database for data on different layers on a map or objects on a map (of course, all in vector format). All the client computer can do with this data is display the layers or objects. The only "analysis" that could take place is a user can look at the data on the screen and compare the way the data looks through visual inspection. The present invention, however, due to the data being in a universal format and being substantially more inclusive (and the fact that the client computer has processing capability through the JAVA applet) can transform or derive new data based upon the original data. A user can query the underlying data in a spatial manner (such as request all streets within a certain distance from a particular spatial point) or can actually

PATENT

Navy Case No. 84,219
Application No. 09/877,786

transform the data by creating a new ring around certain aspects of displayed data. This type of client computer interaction is known as a "thick" system.

Based upon this discussion, it should be clear that the newly amended claims overcome the above referenced rejections. As amended, there are several elements found within the claims that are not found within the references (and, henceforth, the references cannot be the proper basis for either an anticipation rejection or an obviousness rejection).

First, as noted above, the references merely disclose using data in a single format. All of the amended claims now include language indicating that the servers provide data in different formats that are readable by the client computer. Second, the claims also include limitations indicating that the present invention allows for geospatial queries between the data sets in different formats. While the examiner has indicated that the references provide for geospatial queries to some extent, the applicant believes that neither reference discloses this limitation. A geospatial query between data points actually compares geospatial features in data sets (such as wherein a user might query distances between different data points). The references do not disclose systems that allow this type of query (they merely would allow a user to view these two different data points). Also, the present claims include limitations related to developing new data from the original data. Again, the examiner indicates that "modified" data is disclosed in the references. To clarify the difference, the applicant has amended the claims to change the term "modified" to "new". While the applicant does not believe that the references actually disclose modifying the original data (merely allowing a user to "modify" what is being viewed is not modifying the data), the references certainly do not disclose a system

PATENT

Navy Case No. 84,219
Application No. 09/877,786

that creates "new" data from the original data (such as allowing a user to create a circle around a portion of the displayed data that meets certain criteria).

Finally, there are several elements within the original claims that the applicant believes are not disclosed within the references as the examiner suggests. First, the references do not disclose using a geospatial metadata server. The examiner indicates that Roy discloses this element in 150 of figure 1. However, element 150 is defined within the reference as a common gateway interface, which merely allows the client computer to interface with the database server. While element 160 in Roy is defined as storage for spatial data, this is nothing like the geospatial metadata server of the present invention which allows for data mining of servers that contain data in different formats. The examiner further points to the disclosure of a MetaMAP file in the Doyle reference to imply the disclosure of this element. However, these elements are nothing alike (as can be seen if one merely reviews the underlying patent which is referenced). Nothing in either of the references discloses or implies the use of such a server that provides the capability discussed in the present application. Further, several of the method steps, defining how the different servers interact in the present invention, are not disclosed or implied by the references as the examiner seems to indicate. The various data requests, extractions, etc. are provided by certain servers (such as the geospatial metadata server) to allow a user to obtain data in different formats and have that data translated to a format readable and useable by the client computer. None of these specific steps are disclosed or implied in the references as the examiner suggests. Such steps disclosed in the references such as a query going to a map query server is not akin to a step such as "extracting data from the relational database using a geospatial metadata server, the geospatial metadata

PATENT

Navy Case No. 84,219
Application No. 09/877,786

server accessing and providing queries to the database server" as set forth in the present claims, regardless of the fact that both talk about data and servers.

Because many of the elements in the present claims are not found or implied in the references, applicant believes that the above rejections no longer apply.

Accordingly, applicant believes that claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 11-20, and 22-28 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the examiner to withdraw all objections and rejections and allow said claims. Should the examiner need more information regarding this matter or have further suggestions regarding this application, feel free to call the undersigned at 401-832-6679.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Homer, Reg. No. 41,848
Attorney for Assignee

NAVAL UNDERSEA WARFARE CENTER
NEWPORT DIVISION
1176 HOWELL STREET
CODE 000C, BLDG. 112T
NEWPORT, RI 02841-1708